1		
1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPO	DRATION COMMISSION
2	CARL J. KUNASEK CHAIRMAN	
3	JIM IRVIN COMMISSIONER	
4	WILLIAM A. MUNDELL	
5	COMMISSIONER	
6	IN THE MATTER OF:	DOCKET NO. S-03177A-98-0000
7	FOREX INVESTMENT SERVICES CORPORATION	
8	2700 N. Central Ave., Suite 1110 Phoenix, AZ 85004	
9	EASTERN VANGUARD FOREX LTD.	DECISION NO
10	2700 N. Central Ave., Suite 1110	ODDED
	Phoenix, AZ 85004	<u>ORDER</u>
11	c/o HWR Services Limited, Registered Agent P.O. Box 71, Craigmuir Chambers	
12	Road Town, Tortola British Virgin Islands	
13	EASTERN VANGUARD GROUP LIMITED	
14	c/o AMS Trustees Limited, Registered Agent Creque Building, Main Street, P.O. Box 116	
15	Road Town, Tortola British Virgin Islands	
16	, and the second	
17	K. (DAVID) SHARMA Eastern Vanguard Forex Ltd.	
18	P. O. Box 71, Craigmuir Chambers Road Town, Tortola	
19	British Virgin Islands	
20	SAMMY LEE CHUN WING Eastern Vanguard Group Limited	
21	Creque Building, Main Street, P.O. Box 116 Road Town, Tortola	
22	British Virgin Islands	
23	PETER SUEN SUK TAK	
24	Eastern Vanguard Group Limited Creque Building, Main Street, P.O. Box 116	
25	Road Town, Tortola British Virgin Islands	
	JAMES CHARLES SIMMONS, JR. 5045 N. 58 <sup>th</sup> Ave. #23A	
26	5045 N. 58 <sup>th</sup> Ave. #23A Glendale, AZ 85301	
27		
28		

27				
TO FAI CHENG 1800 Van Ness, 2 <sup>nd</sup> FI. San Francisco, CA 94109  JEAN YUEN 439 3 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94118  Y & T INC. and TOKYO INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LTD. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> FI. San Francisco, CA 94109  WING MING TAM c/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> FI. San Francisco, CA 94109  GUO QUAN ZHANG O/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> FI. San Francisco, CA 94109  GUO QUAN ZHANG O/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> FI. San Francisco, CA 94109  Respondents.  Open Meeting April 25 and 26, 2000 Phoenix, Arizona  BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter. 2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Respondent with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is		839 Faxon Avenue		
439 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue 439 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue 53a Francisco, CA 94118 7 7 8 8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 10 10		TO FAI CHENG 1800 Van Ness, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl.		
NTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LTD.  1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl. San Francisco, CA 94109  WING MING TAM  c/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd.  1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl. San Francisco, CA 94109  GUO QUAN ZHANG  O/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd.  1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl. San Francisco, CA 94109  Respondents.  Open Meeting April 25 and 26, 2000 Phoenix, Arizona  BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss  Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Respondents with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the excepton of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is		439 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue		
c/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl. San Francisco, CA 94109  GUO QUAN ZHANG O/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl. San Francisco, CA 94109  Respondents.  Open Meeting April 25 and 26, 2000 Phoenix, Arizona  BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss  Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Respondent with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	8	INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LTD. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl.		
O/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl. San Francisco, CA 94109  Respondents.  Open Meeting April 25 and 26, 2000 Phoenix, Arizona  BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Respondents with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	10	c/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl.		
Open Meeting April 25 and 26, 2000 Phoenix, Arizona  BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Responder with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	13	O/o Tokyo International Investment Ltd. 1800 Van Ness Ave., 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fl.		
Open Meeting April 25 and 26, 2000 Phoenix, Arizona  BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss  Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Responder with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the exceptor of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	15	Respondents.		
BY THE COMMISSION:  FINDINGS OF FACT  1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss  Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Responder with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	16	April 25 and 26, 2000		
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 20 21 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 21 20 21 21 20 21 21 20 21 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 20 21 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 28 29 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20		BY THE COMMISSION:		
1. On March 31, 2000, the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") iss  Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Responder with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	18	FINDINGS OF FACT		
Decision No. 62403 ("Decision") in the above-captioned matter.  2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Responder with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	19			
21 2. On April 7, 2000, pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112, the above-captioned Responder 22 with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission 23 Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that 24 Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law. 25 3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed 26 response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except 27 of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	20			
with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr. filed with the Commission Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	21			
Application for Rehearing and Review ("Application") of the Decision on the grounds that Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	22			
Decision is not justified by the evidence and is contrary to law.  3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	23			
3. On April 14, 2000, the Commission's Securities Division ("Division") filed response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the except of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	24	1		
response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the exceptor of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	25			
of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	26			
of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is	27	response and requested that the Application filed by above-captioned Respondents with the exception		
	28	of Respondent Simmons be denied on the basis that the Decision is based on the evidence and is no		

2

DECISION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

	DOCKET NO. S-03177A-98-0000				
1	contrary to law.				
2	4. The Division's request to deny the Application is well made and should be adopted.				
3	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW				
4	1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the				
5	Arizona Constitution, A.R.S. §§ 44-1801 et seq. And A.A.C. R14-3-112.				
6	2. The Respondents have not demonstrated adequate grounds to justify further review of				
7	the Decision pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-112.				
8	3. The Application as filed by the Respondents should be denied.				
9	ORDER				
10	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Application for Rehearing and Review of the above				
11	captioned Respondents with the exception of Respondent James Charles Simmons, Jr., is hereby				
12	denied.				
13	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.				
14	BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.				
15					
16					
17	CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER				
18					
19					
20	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have				
21	hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix				
22	this day of, 2000.				
23					
24	BRIAN C. McNEIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY				
25					
26	DISSENT MES:bbs				
27					
28					
	2 PEGIGIONING				

3

DECISION NO.

1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	FOREX INVESTMENT SERVICES CORPORATION EASTERN VANGUARD FOREX LTD., EASTERN	
2		VANGUARD GROUP LIMITED, K. (DAVID) SHARMA, SAMMY LEE CHUN WING, PETER	
3		SUEN SUK TAK, MICHAEL E. CHO, TO FAI CHENG, JEAN YUEN, Y & T INC. DBA TOKYO	
4 5		INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT LTD, WING MING TAM, GUO QUAN ZHANG, AND JAMES CHARLES SIMMONS, JR.	
6	DOCKET NO.	S-03177A-98-0000	
7			
8	James Charles Simmons, Jr. 411 Hancock Lane		
9	Pensacola, Florida 32503-7761 Respondent Pro Se		
10	Paul J. Roshka, Jr.		
11	Alan S. Baskin ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF		
12	Two Arizona Center 400 N. 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1000		
13	Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Attorneys for all Respondents except		
14	James Charles Simmons		
15	ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE  1275 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007		
16			
17			
18	W. Mark Sendrow, Director Securities Division		
19	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSIC 1300 West Washington Street	ON	
20	Phoenix, Arizona 85007		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	1		